

KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)
United States Attorney

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)
Chief, Criminal Division

JULIE A. ARBUCKLE (CSBN 193425)
Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-7102
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234

Attorneys for the United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	No. 3 07 70011 JL
)	
Plaintiff,)	STIPULATION AND PROPOSED
)	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
v.)	
)	
VERNON WHITE,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

On January 29, 2007, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that time should be excluded from the calculations under the Speedy Trial Act, Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1, and 18 U.S.C. §3142(f)(2)(B) from January 29, 2007 to February 6, 2007 for effective preparation of counsel, in that defense counsel required adequate time to obtain and review information relevant to the government's motion for detention of defendant. The parties represented that there is good cause for granting the continuance, and that it was the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public

1 and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

2 SO STIPULATED:

3
4 KEVIN V. RYAN
5 United States Attorney

6 DATED: January 29, 2007

7 /s/
JULIE A. ARBUCKLE
Assistant United States Attorney

8 DATED: January 29, 2007

9 /s/
STEVEN KALAR
10 Attorney for Defendant Vernon White

11
12 As the Court found on January 29, 2007, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds
13 that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the
14 defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the calculations under the
15 Speedy Trial Act, Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1, and 18 U.S.C. §3142(f)(2)(B) from
16 January 29, 2007 to February 6, 2007 for good cause and the effective preparation of defense
17 counsel. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would
18 deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise
19 of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

20
21 SO ORDERED.

22
23 DATED: 1/31/07

